



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of books without the borrower's card. Apropos to the latter point, Miss Martin said: "Is it consistent with efficient business principles to refuse to accept books from a person who has returned from one to six without a card? If refused often they must take them to the office, or possibly home, or carry them about on a shopping trip. If he were given a receipt for the books returned and discharged later it is obvious it would be a great accommodation to the borrower and possibly not absolutely disastrous to the loan department. . . . Some of us never issue a book without a card, others issue on a deposit card, the deposit covering the price of the book . . . with a Firm card issued in the name of the firm . . . on special permits. These are all substitutes for a temporary card.

"Is there danger of stimulating the habit of using this kind of card instead of the regular? Evidently there is no real danger in the matter for some when we recall that Sioux City and a few others have dispensed with borrower's cards entirely."

No one from Sioux City being present that method was described by those who had visited Sioux City or had talked with members of the staff of that library and by one librarian who used a similar method in her library.

Among the questions raised were the following:

What receipt has the borrower to show he has returned the book?

Does it not take more of the borrower's time for him to have his application looked up each time a book is charged than it would if he presented a card with the book? In a library system with branches would it not mean much duplication of records or else cause the borrower to wait while his record was being obtained from the central library? Could this method be used where a limited number of books was issued?

Miss Jessie Welles of Toledo read a paper, entitled

#### A FLEXIBLE BOOK COLLECTION

(See p. 237)

There were present a number who had worked as branch librarians, in the stations, in the office of the superintendent of circulation, etc., in libraries where similar systems to those described by Miss Welles were being used who spoke of what an improvement a flexible book collection was over the fixed collections, both for library and patrons.

The question of what is to be done with the "dead wood" which inevitably collects in the main collection was touched, but time was too short to permit a discussion of this problem.

Mr. Arthur L. Bailey was chosen chairman for next year, and the meeting then adjourned.

AGNES F. P. GREER,

Secretary.

## THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIES' ROUND TABLE

The Theological Libraries' Round Table met Saturday afternoon, June 23, with Dr. Frank G. Lewis in the chair. The minutes of the last meeting were read by the secretary, John F. Lyons, and were approved. Messrs. Root, Oko, and Carré were appointed a nominating committee.

After a short discussion on a few matters of business, the report of the committee

on Theological classification was called for. This committee was appointed last year at Asbury Park and consists of Miss Julia Pettee and Messrs. F. G. Lewis, and J. F. Lyons. The report was read by the chairman and was in part as follows:

During the year the committee has made an exhaustive survey of theological classification in the theological libraries of this

country and Canada and has gathered and made available a collection of existing schemes.

To that end a circular letter was sent to about 150 of the theological and religious libraries in this country and Canada. Replies were received from 67, all but 5, as far as we have statistics, of the important Protestant libraries in the United States; only 13 out of the 67 being from libraries of less than 10,000 volumes.

Three libraries reporting are not classified at all; 11 are practically on the old fixed shelf basis. In this group are some of our largest and most important libraries, Auburn, Lane, Princeton, the Dutch Reformed at New Brunswick. Four more, still largely on the fixed shelf basis, are introducing relative classifications. One library reports the old Poole system. All of the fixed shelf systems were barred from this discussion.

This leaves 52 libraries classified completely or in part by some relative system; 27 use Dewey for their entire collection; 6 in connection with an original scheme for theology, and 3 more with the fixed shelf location. Thus 36 libraries out of 52 have some connection with Dewey. Five have Cutter, in some form; 3 use the Hartford scheme or originals based upon it; 1 Lutheran seminary has followed Mt. Airy; 4 besides Union are putting in the Union scheme or are planning for it; 6 others have introduced original schemes of their own.

This shows that in the movement towards reorganization, Dewey is in possession of the field. We have tried to tabulate these Dewey replies. Only 4 of the 27 using the entire Dewey report no changes. Many of the changes are so extensive, we were tempted to class them as original schemes. We have, however, restricted the term, "Original scheme" to systems which have completely discarded Dewey.

We asked how satisfactory they found Dewey for a theological collection. The replies we sorted into 4 grades: emphatically no good, unsatisfactory, fairly satisfactory,

and satisfactory. Counting out the 6 libraries which have rejected Dewey for the strictly theological part of their collection, the replies are as follows: 2 emphatically no good, 11 unsatisfactory, 8 fairly satisfactory, 3 satisfactory. Remember that many of the libraries answering satisfactory have made extensive changes. We put this question to the theological libraries: If the Dewey Advisory Committee should recommend thorough-going changes for theology, would your library be willing to conform to this revision? Five answered yes, 14 said they would consider, and only 7 answered definitely no, or doubtful.

This is the case for the Dewey. Half of our larger libraries are classified by this system, but half of these are actively dissatisfied and ready to consider changes, if not to make them. Only 4 have made no changes at all.

Among the thorough-going revisions and expansions are the ones made by the Chicago Congregational Seminary, the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and by Mr. Ayres of Garrett. One of the best revisions of Dewey has been made for the University of Pennsylvania Library by Dr. Jastrow. A number of libraries have sent to the committee various expansions and minor changes. We have gathered these into a portfolio which the committee places at the disposal of any libraries interested.

The question arises whether it would be worth while to make a standard revision of Dewey's 200's. The A. L. A. Dewey Advisory committee has ascertained that there is no demand for this from public libraries and they are not likely to undertake it. This question the committee wishes to leave open for debate by the Round Table. If the committee should study the various Dewey expansions and revisions and make recommendations, would the result be of enough value to libraries using Dewey to pay for the trouble?

To the libraries already using Dewey it is suggested, simply to withdraw from the Dewey scheme any class that breaks down completely, select an adequate classi-

fication for this special class and give it a notation which cannot be confused with the Dewey. The General Theological Seminary of New York did this for their liturgies which outgrew Dewey. The special notation seems the best disposition of single unwieldy groups. It is one defect of the Dewey that the notation for theology is restricted to the units between 200 and 299, making an unnecessarily long number. Why not use the complete series of units from 100-999? The Chicago Congregational Seminary based its classification upon Dewey but redistributed the Dewey notation so that the whole 999 units were largely used for theology.

In summing up for Dewey the replies, in the opinion of the majority of this committee, hardly warrant its adoption by any library contemplating reorganization. Mr. Lewis dissents, favoring Dewey, and he will give his reasons in a minority report.

To take up other general classifications, there seems to be little dissatisfaction expressed by the few libraries which have adopted Cutter. The most important of these is the Andover-Harvard. Dr. Gates has made a few changes and expansions and substituted a numerical for the letter notation for the entire sections of theology.

Without doubt the most important of the general classifications is going to be the Library of Congress scheme. We have the advance manuscript of the section for theology. It differs from all other schemes in the emphasis it places on denominational development. The denominational divisions are made the all-embracing groups. General denominational history, the history of the denomination in each country, denominational law and polity, liturgical, creedal and doctrinal developments are lumped together under denominational categories. This breaks up certain old orthodox groups, viz. church history by country, church law, liturgies and creeds. In theological libraries these are usually considered main groups with denominational subdivisions. The L. C. scheme leaves in these classes only general works covering several denominations.

There is much to be said for this denominational emphasis, but at least it is a mistake to scatter liturgies under the denominational groups. There certainly has been a continuity of development in liturgies that transcends denominational lines. As far as we can judge, if a library wishes to put in a general scheme this promises to be the preferable one.

Coming to original schemes, the Hartford is the pioneer. This is based on Hagenbach's encyclopedia and makes the main divisions of Exegetical material, Text, Introduction, and Commentary, rather than the more usual modern divisions: Whole Bible, Old Testament, and New Testament. It was an excellent scheme when made but as it has not been kept up to date it is quite inadequate now.

Mr. Reed's scheme for the Lutheran Seminary at Mt. Airy follows the Hartford cleavage of Text, Introduction, and Commentary as main divisions. It is worked out especially from the point of view of the Lutheran Reformation and has very useful suggestions for Lutheran material. A sharp line of division is drawn between the subject matter of Revealed Religion and other material and Dewey is used for non-theological classes.

Dr. Wilbur of the Pacific Unitarian school offers a special scheme, seemingly well worked out and fitted with special tables.

The Rochester classification and that made by Union Seminary of New York may be considered together. The Rochester Faculty demanded a scheme which would bring together theological and allied secular material used in the courses of instruction. The attempt was made, for instance, to correlate the church history of Europe with its corresponding political developments, i. e., the Holy Roman empire and the papacy; to group religious education and Sunday Schools with general educational theory, and to bring the social work of the church into relationship with community movements. But this attempt was not thorough enough to be completely successful. The Union scheme developed this

idea systematically throughout the whole classification and is an improvement upon the Rochester scheme. Dr. Charles R. Gillelt was working upon a scheme for Union before the Rochester classification was begun and the present Union scheme is in large measure based upon this work. It has been tried out upon the classed subject catalog but is applied as yet only in certain sections to the books, and so is still largely tentative. It is indexed and is available in typewritten form. It is revised, as a matter of course, when it is put in and there probably will always be some places to expand or make over. A static classification for all generations is not possible. Like everything else of importance in the world it has to be kept up to date to be permanently useful.

Two other special schemes deserve notice, the scheme for the Day Missions library at Yale, and Miss Hering's scheme for the Missionary research library based upon it.

It will be seen that there are two types of classification in the field, one the general classification, the other the special classification is considered, second, upon of the special field of religion. On the relative usefulness of these two types, the committee disagrees. The majority favor the special classification. Mr. Lewis is in favor of a general scheme for which he will give arguments in a minority report.

The choice between these two types, it seems to the majority, depends upon two things, first, upon how important a matter classification is considered, second upon what a theological library wants. If we take the ground that the users of the library depend upon the catalog rather than upon the shelves, the classification is a matter of small importance and Dewey will serve as well as any other scheme. The majority report, however, regards classification as of large importance. It takes the position that when the shelves are accessible and well arranged, both professors and students go directly to them to a very large extent and for that reason a classification giving the most convenient

arrangement on the shelves is greatly to be desired. In the second place, granting the importance of classification, what do theological libraries ask of it? This is the real question in deciding between the two types.

There is one class of theological library barred from any choice. A divinity school library which is a part of a university collection must have, of course, the classification which best serves the needs of the whole collection and this is a general classification.

But there is no reason why theological libraries which are not parts of a general library should not have a classification which best serves their special needs. In the experience of the majority of this committee, the seminary men want that material together which is related from the point of view of their work. They want to go, for instance, to an alcove where they will find not only Sunday School material but all available on educational psychology and educational theory which they need in their work on religious education. When the men are studying missions they want all the information the library has on the missionary countries right at hand side by side with the missionary activities of that country, and so on all through the different departments of seminary work. There are certain fixed demands made by the work of all theological seminaries which the classification should take into consideration. We think theological libraries wish a classification which will do justice to these demands, and also that correlation can be obtained only by a special classification made from the point of view of the field of religion. A general classification loses sight of the whole purpose of the special collection.

The committee has made a practically complete collection of all existing special schemes, and of the adaptations and expansions of Dewey and Cutter. This material the committee places at the disposal of all libraries interested.

After the reading of the majority report, Dr. Lewis offered the chair to Mr. Harned

and gave his opinion as a minority report, the substance of which is as follows:

"While we have called our report one on theological classification, it actually deals with the whole field of religion, not even being limited to the field of Christianity, of which theology is ordinarily one aspect. In some sense, also, we are compelled to face the question of a classification of knowledge as a whole, at least in the relation of religion to the other branches of knowledge. More particularly we face the question of the classification of books on religion. We must think also of a notation for whatever classification we accept. Then, as a prior question, we must consider the relation between classifying books and cataloging the material which they contain.

"In my opinion the proper indexing of the material of books adequately by author, title and subject, including analyticals for significant chapters, is more important than the subject of classification. Books are made in such fashion that frequently even an ideal classification of them would fall to bring more or less of the material where it would be available. Only analytical subject heading can perform the service which is desired. Accordingly, while I regard the Dewey classification as anything but a proper analysis of religion, I find it a practical tool if the cataloging or indexing is carefully and thoroughly done.

"I find myself differing from the majority of the committee also on the question of whether a library of religion should use a general classification or should select a special one, such as has been done by Rochester, Union and some others. I regard the general classification as preferable even for such institutions. My reasons are in brief three: First, as I have proved through some years of daily work, a general classification is entirely practicable. The decimal classification can be used without serious difficulty. Secondly, a general classification is economic. We already *have* such classifications, and it does not impose upon users the necessity of familiarizing themselves with a special classification for each individual theo-

logical institution as they may go from one to another. Thirdly, a general classification is necessary for the welfare of religion itself when the subject is viewed in the large. If the notation which they employ from day to day appears as a general one and non-religious books are classed with those on religion, students are almost certain to come to feel that religion is all of life rather than simply one segment of it. A general classification quietly keeps before students the proper perspective of the different aspects of knowledge as men and women ought to view it.

"From this point of view, then, what should libraries do? I should be disposed to reply that those which are already using the decimal classification might very well continue to employ it, making such adaptations and expansions as may be necessary. The work of the committee has revealed that a number of important libraries and probably more smaller ones have not yet removed from the fixed shelf arrangement. In the course of time these and other libraries will recatalog and reclassify. The Library of Congress has already worked out in detail the classification which will be employed in that immense collection. Libraries planning to reclassify should consider the L. C. scheme. If not, I believe the adoption of the Dewey classification as well known and widely used would be advisable. As I have suggested above, this point of view must not be interpreted as an approval of the Dewey classification of religion. In fact as an analysis of the subject of religion it seems to me to be totally unsatisfactory. I have, therefore, brought with me an outline of an entirely different and far more radical analysis of religion as evidence of my non-acceptance of the Dewey analysis, though I find the notation practicable for ordinary use. In my analysis I have adopted some numbers equivalent to the Dewey notation, showing how such numbers might be used. Not that any such analysis will become in the near future or farther away the basis for a working classification. I only use it as evidence that while I can use the Dewey

classification without difficulty for practical purposes I do not accept it as a real analysis of the subject of religion as a whole."

A discussion of the report followed. Mr. Hanson said that the library of the Divinity school of the University of Chicago library would be reclassified according to the L. C. scheme, but that theological libraries not a part of a university might well favor a special scheme. Mr. Root said that both the classification and catalog were equally useful tools and agreed with Mr. Lewis that Dewey was perfectly practical for a theological collection. Mr. Voge suggested that recommendations made by theological libraries to the Decimal Advisory Committee would be considered by that committee. Mr. Harned moved that the

committees be continued for another year and instructed to present to the A. L. A. Advisory Committee on the D. C. suggestions toward a revision of the 200's. This motion was carried.

The question of a union list of religious periodicals and serials was discussed briefly.

A suggestion that the word theology in the name of the Round Table be changed to some broader term raised a lively discussion over the scope of the word. It was finally decided to change the name to the Round Table of the Libraries of Religion and Theology.

Dr. L. M. Robinson, librarian of the Philadelphia Divinity School, was elected chairman for the next year, and Miss Julia Pettee of New York, secretary.

## LEAGUE OF LIBRARY COMMISSIONS

### Mid-year Meeting, Louisville, Ky., June 23, 1917

The mid-year meeting of the League of Library Commissions was held in the Red Room of the Seelbach Hotel, at 2:30 p. m., June 23, with Mrs. Elizabeth Claypool Earl, president of the Indiana Library Commission, presiding. Seventeen of the twenty-nine states belonging to the league were represented by twenty-two persons officially connected with the respective commissions.

Prof. Will D. Howe, head of the English Department of Indiana University, opened the program with a talk on "The part of state supported library activities in the educational program of the state." Mr. Howe spoke of the change in the ideal of library service from one of nourishing culture to one of training for service. The moving picture, the newspaper, and the library have taken their place beside the church, the school, and the home as factors of popular education. He made an appeal for popular support of libraries and declared that public sentiment must realize

that the library is the heart of the community.

The second part of the program was devoted to a discussion regarding the best unit for library extension—state, county, district or township.

Miss Minnie W. Leatherman of North Carolina read a paper on

THE STATE AS A UNIT FOR LIBRARY EXTENSION  
(See p. 230)

Miss Harriet C. Long of the Brumback Library of Van Wert, Ohio, followed with a paper entitled

THE COUNTY AS A UNIT FOR LIBRARY EXTENSION  
(See p. 232)

Mr. John A. Lowe, agent of the Massachusetts Free Library Commission, next outlined the plan in operation in Massachusetts in a paper on

THE LIBRARY DISTRICT AS A UNIT FOR LIBRARY EXTENSION  
(See p. 234)